



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS

The Clouds of Aristophanes. The Greek Text revised, with a Translation into Corresponding Metres, Introduction and Commentary. By Benjamin Bickley Rogers. London: George Bell and Sons (1916). Pp. 230. \$3.25.

This work presents a phenomenon probably unparalleled in the history of authorship—a revised edition appearing almost two-thirds of a century after the first edition was published (1852). It contains an Introduction (28 pages), the Arguments, the Text, the Translation, the Commentary, Supplemental Notes, and Appendix.

The Introduction, of course, is devoted partly to a discussion of the revision. This discussion is greatly simplified by the theory of the editor that the revised play was not intended for the stage and that the revision (if I understand him) was completed. He maintains also that some of the changes were not as radical as is often supposed. He regards it as absurd, for instance, to suppose that the *Λόγοι* did not appear and hold a debate in the original play. The Argument, so often cited, states only that this part was changed, not that it was for the first time inserted in the revised play.

It would require much space to discuss the grounds on which the editor denies that the revised play was intended for performance. He maintains that only in exceptional cases was it allowed to reproduce comedies. One additional bit of evidence, produced to show that the revised play was not intended for the stage, Mr. Rogers derives from 546, *οὐδ' ὑμᾶς ἔγρω' ἑκαταῖν δὲς καὶ τριῖς ταῦτ' ἐλαδύων*, which he renders by "neither do I twice or thrice my pieces show". Both in the Introduction and in the note on this verse the editor says that this verse plainly shows that the piece could not have been intended for performance after revision. Now, in the first place, it seems evident that the poet had in mind not reproduction of plays, but the repeated presentation of the same ideas or motives in different plays. The verse means 'Nor do I seek to deceive you, presenting again and again the same ideas (as my rivals do)'. In the second place, if the editor's translation were correct, the passage would completely disprove his theory that it was not allowed to reproduce plays in the theater.

The rest of the Introduction treats very satisfactorily the object the poet had in view when he wrote the original play.

In the work before us there is nowhere any recognition of the important results attained by Zielinski in his *Gliederung der Altattischen Komödie*. Even Aristotle's definition of the *parodos* of tragedy is applied to this comedy as it was in the days of Felton. The other pieces edited by the author are not at hand.

The Translation has been left almost without change from that of the first edition. As the author says, it is rather a paraphrase than a translation, and in some instances even the sense has been changed. No classical scholar needs to be told that this version fails, as all versions must fail, to reproduce the tone, or the coloring, or the aroma, or whatever it should be called, of the original. The forms of verse selected for the various meters seem as appropriate as could have been chosen, except, perhaps, that the task was rendered more difficult by superabundant use of rhyme.

The Commentary is nearly all rewritten. When a note is retained from the first edition, it is placed within quotation marks and (1852) is added. This commentary excellently elucidates allusions to people and events, and some readers will probably commend it for absolutely refraining from the discussion of grammatical questions.

Under Supplemental Notes are given (1) a translation (41 lines) in verse of a passage from a comedy of Epicrates, preserved by Athenaeus (2, Chapter 54), and (2) a similar translation (28 lines) of a passage from the Cheiron of Pherecrates, preserved by Plutarch in his treatise on music (Chapter 30, page 1141).

The Appendix is devoted chiefly to the MSS and critical notes. Sixty-one of the MSS of the Clouds that have been collated are enumerated. The collations are shown to be for the most part incredibly inaccurate, those of Velsen excepted, but Velsen did not collate the Clouds.

For the preparation of the critical notes the editor had at hand forty-three editions, beginning with Aldus, 1498, and ending with Starkie, 1911. He selected only such conjectures as seemed to be of special interest or have received some acceptance. The selections seem to be very judicious. Of course no one ever approves all the views of another in textual criticism, and the reviewer must express his surprise at finding *οἱς ἡδὺ καὶ λέγειν*, in 528, rendered by "To whom 'tis joy to speak", without mention, either in the critical notes or in the commentary, of any difficulty.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA.

The Jews among the Greeks and Romans. By Max Radin. Philadelphia: Jewish Publishing Society (1915). Pp. 421. \$1.50.

Jewish history in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era forms one of the most important subjects for the historian's study. Undoubtedly its greatest importance in world history is in furnishing the background for early Christianity and from this standpoint the books upon it are legion. More rare are the works written from the classical point of view, though the problem of assimilation presented to Macedonian and Roman statesmen by this most intractable of peoples is worthy of study by a nation which to-day has essentially the same problem. Histories from the Jewish standpoint are few, and still more unusual is it to find a history which combines the Jewish and the classical viewpoint.

Our author is a Jew and his book is included in a series intended to acquaint the young American Jew with the past of his race. He writes, therefore, with "an abiding reverence for the history of my own people". At the same time, he is a recognized authority on certain phases of classical life and confesses for that life "a passionate affection that is frankly unreasoning". In other words, we have once more the interesting phenomenon of a Hellenizing Jew, attempting to make attractive to his fellow Jews a civilization which has been, since the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, the "abomination of desolation" to the orthodox.

For this reason, we have what may seem a strange book to the student of ancient history. Easily a half consists of well known facts, necessary as a background for the more specialized study, and which cannot be assumed as known to readers. In general, this portion is well written, though here and there one may express doubt. For example, we are surprised to find the statement that there is no indication of deification of living men before Alexander, when we all remember the honors to Lysander almost a century before. The one field where Dr. Radin seems not at home is the period of Macedonian rule. We find no reference to the standard writers, such as Droysen, Niese, Strack, Kärst, Bevan, Ferguson, Bouché-Leclercq, and no evidence that they have been used. There is much blurring because our author does not recognize the difference between Greek and Macedonian rule, between Hellenic and Hellenistic